Case 4:13-cv-05914-HSG Document 96 Filed 12/28/15 Page 1 of 4

1 2 3 4 5 6	Thomas A. Kearney, State Bar No. 90045 tak@kearneylittlefield.com Prescott W. Littlefield, State Bar No. 259049 pwl@kearneylittlefield.com KEARNEY LITTLEFIELD LLP 3436 N. Verdugo Rd., Ste. 230 Glendale, CA 91208 Telephone (213) 473-1900 Facsimile (213) 473-1919	
7 8	Gene J. Stonebarger, State Bar No. 209461 gstonebarger@stonebargerlaw.com Richard D. Lambert, State Bar No. 251148 rlambert@stonebargerlaw.com	
9 10	STONEBARGER LAW A Professional Corporation 75 Iron Point Circle, Suite 145	
11 12	Folsom, CA 95630 Telephone (916) 235-7140 Facsimile (916) 235-7141	
13	Attorneys for Plaintiff Mendez and the Class	
14	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT
15		RICT OF CALIFORNIA
ا ۔ ا		
16		
16 17 18	JAMIE MENDEZ, an individual, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated	Case No.3:13-cv-05914-HSG
		Case No.3:13-cv-05914-HSG STIPULATION TO CONTINUE CERTAIN DATES AND ORDER
17 18	of herself and all others similarly situated	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE
17 18 19 20 21	of herself and all others similarly situated Plaintiff,	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE
17 18 19 20 21 22	of herself and all others similarly situated Plaintiff, v. C-TWO GROUP, INC.; MOBILESOTRM,	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE
117 118 119 220 221 222 233	of herself and all others similarly situated Plaintiff, v. C-TWO GROUP, INC.; MOBILESOTRM, INC.; and DOES 1-50, inclusive,	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE
117 118 119 220 221 222 223 224	of herself and all others similarly situated Plaintiff, v. C-TWO GROUP, INC.; MOBILESOTRM, INC.; and DOES 1-50, inclusive,	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE
117 118 119 220 221 222 233	of herself and all others similarly situated Plaintiff, v. C-TWO GROUP, INC.; MOBILESOTRM, INC.; and DOES 1-50, inclusive,	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE
117 118 119 220 221 222 23 224 225	of herself and all others similarly situated Plaintiff, v. C-TWO GROUP, INC.; MOBILESOTRM, INC.; and DOES 1-50, inclusive,	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	of herself and all others similarly situated Plaintiff, v. C-TWO GROUP, INC.; MOBILESOTRM, INC.; and DOES 1-50, inclusive,	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	of herself and all others similarly situated Plaintiff, v. C-TWO GROUP, INC.; MOBILESOTRM, INC.; and DOES 1-50, inclusive,	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE

10

16

14

17

18

20

19

2122

2324

2526

2728

TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

Plaintiff Jamie Mendez and Defendants C-Two Group, Inc., and C & L Associates, Inc. (together with C-Two Group, "Defendants" and together with Plaintiff the "Parties") by and through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

WHEREAS, pursuant to this Court's Order, the Parties submitted a Joint Proposed Case Schedule on June 9, 2015;

WHEREAS, on June 15, 2015, the Court ordered, among other dates, the following dates:

- 1) Rule 26 initial expert disclosures date is January 22, 2016;
- 2) Rule 26 rebuttal expert disclosures date is February 19, 2016;
- 3) And the Discovery cut off date for both fact and expert discovery is March 18, 2016; [Docket No. 78]

WHEREAS, Defendants have moved for summary judgment, Plaintiff opposed, and the Court held a hearing on Defendants' motions;

WHEREAS, the Court has Ordered that Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification is granted, and Ordered the Parties to meet and confer to submit a stipulation regarding a notice procedure;

WHEREAS, the Parties have met and conferred and concurrently herewith are submitting a stipulation regarding a notice procedure;

WHEREAS, the Parties proposed notice procedure will likely take nearly 60 days from the date the Court accepts the Parties proposed notice procedure (with or without revisions to the proposal), including time for Defendants to provide a class list to the Claims Administrator; for the Claims Administrator to format the list and provide notice to the Class; and for Class Members to choose to opt-out or refrain from so doing;

WHEREAS, the time for Class Members to opt-out will likely extend until the Parties' previous proposed dates to close discovery and conduct expert discovery;

WHEREAS, the Parties are desirous of waiting until the Court enters an Order regarding summary judgment so that they can assess the status of the case before engaging in any potential additional discovery, both fact and expert;

Case 4:13-cv-05914-HSG Document 96 Filed 12/28/15 Page 4 of 4

ORDER PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: December 28, 2015 United States District Court Judge Northern District of California